

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1-3.

The attached Replacement Sheets 1/2 and 2/2, which include Figures 1-3, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 20-25 and 27-40 are now pending in the application. Claims 20-38 stand rejected. By this paper, Claim 26 has been cancelled and Claims 21-24 and 27-36 have been amended; support for which can be found throughout the application as originally filed. Support for newly added Claims 39 and 40 can be found throughout the application as originally filed. As such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). In particular, the Examiner contends that the support element of Claim 35 must be shown in the drawings or cancelled from the claims and the first and second side walls in the claims must be consistent with those described in the drawings and specification. The drawings also stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for failing to include reference character "28" from the description. Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims and specification render these objections moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Office's approval. In the following Replacement Sheets, changes have been made to correct various informalities and improve the clarity of the drawings. In Replacement Sheet 1/2, the reference number 20 has been removed and the reference numbers 23 and 34 have been moved to more clearly depict these features. In Replacement Sheet 2/2 (Fig. 2), the reference number

20 has been removed. In Replacement Sheet 2/2 (Fig. 3), the figure has been mirrored to more easily show the comparison to Fig. 2. Additionally, the reference numbers 16, 19, 20, and 31 have been removed and reference number 24 has been added.

SPECIFICATION / ABSTRACT

The specification and abstract stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification and abstract according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 28-30, 33, and 36 stand objected to for various informalities. Applicants have amended certain claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants submit that the remaining objections are rendered moot by the various amendments to the claims and specification. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 28, 30-32, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. These rejections are respectfully accommodated.

In particular, Applicants have amended the naming convention of the first and second side walls, as found in the dependent claims, to accurately identify these features. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 20-23, 27-32, 37, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Satoh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,295,707). Claims 24-26 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that Claim 26 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 26 has been rendered moot.

Applicants note that Satoh discloses an air bag device (10) having a rectangular container (12) and a bottom (16) with an air bag (18) folded therein. See *Col. 2, lines 26-28 and Figure 1*. Upon application of a heavy load to the lid (22) of the air bag device (10), arm portions (34) are bent at notches (46) and the support member (38) buckles midway. See *Col. 2, lines 64-68 and Figure 4*. The support member (38) may also include a fold (60) at its midway to promote buckling. See *Col. 3, lines 17-21 and Figure 5*.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants assert that Satoh does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of amended Claim 20. In particular, Satoh fails to disclose a “generally flat surface includ[ing] a plurality of deformation bridges arranged adjacent a plurality of cut-outs, the deformation bridges deforming to a

predetermined final deformation geometry in response to [a] deformation force.” The Satoh device does not disclose either a plurality of deformation bridges or a plurality of cut-outs adjacent those deformation bridges. Further, the Satoh device does not provide any means for controlled deformation as claimed by the Applicants. Applicants’ controlled deformation is shown in the drawings at reference character 12 of Fig. 3, for example. With respect to claim 39, Applicants would note that the extended portion may be satisfied by element 17 of Fig. 3, for example. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As Claims 21-25 and 27-38 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 20, they are similarly in condition for allowance. Additionally, Applicants assert that amended Claim 22 has independently allowable subject matter as Claim 22 recites, “wherein the second side wall includes a flange area with a flange section around which an interior cladding element can be swivelled generally in the direction of the housing floor in response to deformation of the first side wall.” Applicants note that Satoh discloses that the lid (22) is fixed to the container (12) by means of a rivet or the like. See *Col. 2, lines 47-50*. Upon application of a force, the attachment is broken for the lid (22) to change position. See *Col. 2, lines 59-63*. As such, Satoh does not disclose a rotatable flange as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 21-23, 27-32, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Claims 24, 25, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 39-42 are added herein for consideration. With respect to claim 39, Applicants would note that the extended portion may be satisfied by element 17 of Fig. 3, for example. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 39, as well as Claim 40, dependent therefrom, and independent Claim 41, as well as Claim 42, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Stephen T. Olson
Reg. No. 36,626
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: 25 February 2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

STO/AKC/ca/lf-s
G:\FLOATERS\fbribish -c-\SOlson\8952\5-NP\Amendment due 2-25-2009.doc